

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: JACQUINOT, Daniel

SERIAL NO.: 10/516,375

ART UNIT: 2828

FILED: July 11, 2005

EXAMINER: Wimer, M.C.

TITLE: MULTIBAND PLANAR ANTENNA

AMENDMENT "A"

Director of the U.S. Patent
and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of March 23, 2006, a response being due by June 23, 2006,
please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, previous Claims 1- 7 have been canceled and new
Claims 8 - 13 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing
amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been
entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claims 1 - 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)
as being unpatentable over the Gegan patent. Claims 1 -7 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112,
second paragraph, as being indefinite. Importantly, Claims 4 - 7 were indicated as allowable if
rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

As an overview to the present reply, Applicant has extensively amended the original claim language in the form of new Claims 8 - 13. New Claims 8 - 13 express the original limitations in a more proper U.S. format, including proper antecedent bases and proper structural interrelationships throughout. Any indefinite terminology found in the original claim language has been corrected herein. In particular, the "radiator" is now defined with proper "means-plus-function" terminology so as to indicate that it is a "radiating means" for "radiating with a first frequency".

In particular, new independent Claim 8 reflects the original limitations of independent Claim 1, along with the limitations of objected-to Claim 4. As such, independent Claim 8 should now be in a proper condition for allowance. Dependent Claims 9 and 10 reflect the original limitations, respectively, of original dependent Claims 2 and 3. New independent Claim 11 incorporates the limitations of previous independent Claim 1, along with the limitations of objected-to Claim 5. As such, independent Claim 11 should now be in a proper condition for allowance. Dependent Claims 12 and 13 reflect the limitations, respectively, of original dependent Claims 6 and 7.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claims 8 and 11 are now in a proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon these independent claims should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and

allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

6-21-06

Date

John S. Egbert
Reg. No. 30,627
Andrew With. Chu
Reg. No. 46,625
Attorney for Applicant
Egbert Law Offices
412 Main Street, 7th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(713)224-8080
(713)223-4873 fax